

Attorney Docket Number: SIDR001US0

Application Number: 09/858,085

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated December 28, 2005 has been received and considered. In the Office Action the Examiner renewed the rejections to claims 16-21, 35 – 37, 22-25, 26-28 and 36. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-28 and 35-37 and the Examiner's withdrawal of claims 29-34.

Applicant asserts that with respect to independent claims 16, 35, and 37 that the cited references of Ko and Rothermel et al, taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest a method for "monitoring at one or more times for changes to a firewall policy". A careful review and analysis of the cited Ko reference (col. 6; lines 23-25) discloses receiving a global security policy from a network coordinator for intrusion detection. Ko broadly does not describe a method for monitoring changes to the network system such as changes to a firewall policy.

A careful review and analysis of the Ko reference discloses a system for filtering security information to a global analyzer that decides an appropriate response to be implemented by local analyzers. The cited Ko reference (col. 6 lines 23-25; col. 6 lines 39-44) does not describe a method for "determining whether a firewall policy complies with pre-existing corporate security policies; and generating an alert when a firewall policy is determined not to comply."

The cited Rothermel reference (col. 3, lines 1-2; col. 8, lines 23-25) teaches a system that allows network administrators to review network security information to view if a policy is *being properly implemented*. Rothermel does not teach a method for generating an alert if the firewall policy has been changed.

A careful examination and analysis of cited Ko reference (col. 4, lines 33-34; col. 6 lines 39-44) discloses a system for storing and relaying security information. Ko does not teach or suggest "a method for storing scheduled system change information in a central database".

Ko (col. 6 lines 23-25 and lines 36-38) also discloses a global policy that can be received from a network security administrator and a system for implementing specified sensors and transporting security information. The cited Ko reference (col. 4, lines 33-34) teaches filtering, by a local analyzer security information after local sensors receive such information. Ko does not teach a method for "detecting actual system changes when they

Attorney Docket Number: SIDR001US0**Application Number: 09/858,085**

are made to the system” or a method for “transporting actual system change information to a central database”. Rothermel (col. 5, lines 32-39) discloses a system forwarding the network security information to a host supervisor device, but does not teach “a method comprising recording information on scheduled system changes on a central server log.”

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 16, 35 and 37 is improper at this time and withdrawal of this rejection and their timely allowance is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully renews his argument that neither Ko nor Rothermel make any suggestions that would lead ones skilled in the art to reach Applicant’s claimed invention. Even if there were a suggestion to modify or combine the references the combination or modification would not teach Applicant’s invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner find independent claims 16, 35, and 37 and all claims depending therefore patentable.

Attorney Docket Number: SIDR001US0

Application Number: 09/858,085

Conclusions

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the section 103 rejection and allow claims 16-28, 35 and 37 as currently presented. Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Hayward A. Verdun

Reg. No. 43,223

Dated: May 30, 2006

HULSEYIP Intellectual Property Lawyers, P.C.
Counselors & Attorneys in I.P. Matters
1250 S. Capital of Texas Highway, Bldg 3, Suite 610
Austin, TX 78730
O] 512-795-1295; F] 512-233-2602
C] 512-658-7173

Atty Dkt No: SIDR001US1

Page 13